



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|-------------|------------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/719,879 | 11/20/2003 | Richard Johnson | TRAN-P185 | 3080 |
| 7590 04/14/2008 WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP Third Floor Two North Market Street San Jose, CA 95113 | | | | |
| EXAMINER TRUONG, THANHNGA B | | | | |
| ART UNIT 2135 | | PAPER NUMBER | | |
| MAIL DATE 04/14/2008 | | DELIVERY MODE PAPER | | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/719,879

Applicant(s)

JOHNSON ET AL.

Examiner

Thanhnga B. Truong

Art Unit

2135

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 February 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SI/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on February 01, 2008 has been entered. Claims 1-23 are pending. At this time, claims 1-23 are still rejected.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-23 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hashimoto et al (US 6,983,374 B2), in view of Ellison et al (US 7,082,615 B1), and further in view of Kittirutsunetorn (US 5,081,675)

a. ***Referring to claim 1, 8:***

i. Hashimoto teaches a memory architecture, comprising:

(1) an unprotected memory space configured to store encrypted information, said encrypted information corresponding to a plain text version thereof (**column 5, lines 30-33 and column 15, lines 66-67 of Hashimoto**);

(2) a first protected memory space configured to store at least a subset of operating system instructions (**column 6, lines 20-29 of Hashimoto and Figures 2, 9, and 10 for memory partitioning**); and

(3) a second protected memory space configured to store said plain text version of said encrypted information (**column 10, lines 5-10 of Hashimoto and Figures 2, 9, and 10 for memory partitioning**);

(4) wherein said operating system instructions in said first protected memory space operate on said plain text version of said encrypted information in said second protected memory space (**column 9, lines 35-38 of Hashimoto and Figures 2, 9, and 10 for memory partitioning**);

ii. Although Hashimoto teaches a memory architecture with authentication key, which is another term of message digest, Hashimoto is silent on the capability of disclosing his memory as a flash memory. On the other hand, Ellison teaches both message digest and flash memory in **column 8, lines 55-65 of Ellison**.

iii. It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to:

(1) have modified the invention of Hashimoto with the teaching of Ellison to prevent illegal alternation of execution codes and processing target data under a multi-task program execution environment (**column 1, lines 8-10 of Hashimoto**).

iv. The ordinary skilled person would have been motivated to:

(1) have modified the invention of Hashimoto with the teaching of Ellison to protect both the internally executed algorithm and the data state inside a memory region from illegal analysis in the multi-task environment even when the execution is stopped by the interruption (**column 4, lines 58-62 of Hashimoto**).

v. Although the combination of teaching between Hashimoto and Ellison teaches the claimed subject matter and the storage showing unprotected area, they are silent on the capability of showing the protected storage area (if indeed is not inherently in column 12, lines 40-45 of Ellison). On the other hand, Kittirutsumetorn teaches the protected and unprotected memory space in Figure 4 and column 15, lines 12-32 of Kittirutsumetorn.

vi. It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to:

(1) have modified the invention of Hashimoto with the teaching of Ellison to prevent illegal alternation of execution codes and processing target data under a multi-task program execution environment (**column 1, lines 8-10 of Hashimoto**).

vii. The ordinary skilled person would have been motivated to:

(1) have modified the invention of Hashimoto with the teaching of Ellison to protect both the internally executed algorithm and the data state inside a memory region from illegal analysis in the multi-task environment even when the execution is stopped by the interruption (**column 4, lines 58-62 of Hashimoto**).

b. Referring to claim 2:

i. Hashimoto further teaches:

(1) wherein said encrypted information comprises an instruction to load said encrypted information from said unprotected memory space into said first protected memory space (**column 10, lines 5-10 of Hashimoto and Figures 2, 9, and 10 for memory partitioning**).

c. Referring to claim 3:

i. Hashimoto further teaches:

(1) further comprising one or more instructions to decrypt said encrypted information in said first protected memory space to form said plain text version (**column 11, lines 21-26 of Hashimoto**).

d. Referring to claim 4:

i. Hashimoto further teaches:

(1) wherein said encrypted information comprises an instruction to store at least one of (i) said encrypted information in said first protected memory space, (ii) said plain text version in said first protected memory space, and (iii) said plain text version in said second protected memory space (**column 9, lines 35-38;**

column 10, lines 5-10 of Hashimoto and Figures 9 and 10 for memory partitioning).

e. Referring to claim 5:

i. Hashimoto further teaches:

(1) wherein said unprotected memory space is further configured to store executable code and data (**column 15, lines 49-52 of Hashimoto**).

f. Referring to claim 6:

i. Hashimoto further teaches:

(1) wherein said subset of operating system instructions comprises at least one member selected from the group consisting of: fetching or pre-fetching at least part of said executable code and data; interpreting at least part of said executable code and data; translating at least part of said executable code and data; and determining whether information in said unprotected memory space comprises encrypted information (**column 10, line 56 through column 11, line 4 of Hashimoto**).

g. Referring to claim 7:

i. Hashimoto further teaches:

(1) further comprising a third protected memory configured to store said plain text version after at least one operating system instruction has operated thereon (**column 10, line 56 through column 11, line 4 of Hashimoto**).

h. Referring to claim 8:

i. The combination of teaching between Hashimoto and Ellison teaches the claimed subject matter. Ellison further teaches:

(1) wherein said first protected memory space comprises message digest (**column 8, lines 55-65 of Ellison**).

i. Referring to claim 9:

i. The combination of teaching between Hashimoto and Ellison teaches the claimed subject matter. Hashimoto and Ellison further teach:

(1) wherein said first protected memory space further comprises a table linking said message digest to said plain text version in said second

protected memory space **(see Figures 9 and 10 and column 15, lines 46-48 of Hashimoto; and column 8, lines 55-65 of Ellison).**

j. Referring to claim 10:

i. Hashimoto further teaches:

(1) wherein said table comprises a non-zero location of said plain text version in said second protected memory space **(see Figures 9 and 10 and column 15, lines 46-48 of Hashimoto).**

k. Referring to claim 11:

i. Hashimoto further teaches:

(1) wherein said first protected memory space further comprises a table or list linking a unique identifier for said encrypted information to a pointer for at least one of (i) a location of said plain text version and (ii) a location of a decryption tool for decrypting said encrypted information **(see Figures 9 and 10 and further details on column 7, lines 42-50 of Hashimoto).**

l. Referring to claim 12:

i. This claim consist a system for operating on encrypted

information to implement claim 1, thus it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 1 above.

m. Referring to claim 17:

i. This claim has limitations that is similar to those of claims 1

and 3, thus it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claims 1 and 3 above.

n. Referring to claims 18-21:

i. These claims have limitations that are similar to those of

claims 1-8, thus they are rejected with the same rationale applied against claims 1-8 above.

o. Referring to claim 22:

i. Hashimoto further teaches:

(1) wherein said protected memory comprises a table (see Figure 5, column 7, line 42 of Hashimoto).

p. Referring to claim 23:

i. This claim consist a system for hiding information to implement claim 1, thus it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 1 above.

q. Referring to claims 13-16:

i. Hashimoto further teaches:

(1) wherein said first protected memory space comprises a table (see Figure 5, column 7, line 42 of Hashimoto); said first protected memory space comprises message digest (column 6, line 61 of Hashimoto); wherein said first protected memory space further comprises a table linking a unique identifier for said encrypted information to a pointer for a location of a decryption tool for decrypting said encrypted information (Figures 9 and 10 of Hashimoto); and at least one peripheral device configured to operate in accordance with said encrypted information (see Figures 1 and 2 of Hashimoto).

ii. Although Hashimoto teaches the memory architecture, which is well known in the art that could be implemented into any computer system, Hashimoto is silent on the capability to show the entire computer system which includes the microprocessor, memory, and its peripheral. On the other hand, Ellison teaches these elements (see Figure 1 and column 4, line 38 through column 5, line 27 of Ellison).

iii. It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to:

(1) have modified the invention of Hashimoto with the teaching of Ellison to prevent illegal alternation of execution codes and processing target data under a multi-task program execution environment (column 1, lines 8-10 of Hashimoto).

iv. The ordinary skilled person would have been motivated to:

(1) have modified the invention of Hashimoto with the teaching of Ellison to protect both the internally executed algorithm and the data state inside a memory region from illegal analysis in the multi-task environment even when the execution is stopped by the interruption (**column 4, lines 58-62 of Hashimoto**).

Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thanhnga (Tanya) Truong whose telephone number is 571-272-3858.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kim Vu can be reached at 571-272-3859. The fax and phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 571-272-2100.

/Thanhnga B. Truong/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2135

TBT
April 10, 2008

